```
1
              IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
               FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA
2
3
    United States of America,
4
5
               Plaintiff,
6
                                   FILE NO. 3:19-cr-42
            VS.
7
    Sijie Liu,
8
             Defendant.
9
10
11
12
13
                    TRANSCRIPT
14
                           O F
15
                   PROCEEDINGS
16
               (Change of Plea & Sentencing)
17
                      June 22, 2020
18
                       Pages 1-49
19
20
21
22
    HELD AT: QUENTIN BURDICK UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE
             655 FIRST AVENUE NORTH
23
             FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA 58102
    BEFORE: THE HONORABLE PETER D. WELTE
24
25
    COURT REPORTER: KELLY A. KROKE
```

1	APPEARAN	CES		
2	MR. NICHOLAS W. CHASE		₽∩D	PLAINTIFF;
3	Acting U.S. Attorney 655 1st Avenue North, Ste. 250 Fargo, ND 58102 MR. ALEXANDER REICHERT Attorney at Law 118 Belmont Road Grand Forks, ND 58201	COUNSEL	FOR	PLAINIIFF,
4		COUNCEL	EOD	DEEENDAMM.
5		COUNSEL	FOR	DEFENDANT;
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 (June 22, 2020: The following proceedings 3 commenced at 11:05 a.m.:) THE COURT: We're on the record in United 4 States of America versus Liu. Am I pronouncing that 5 6 correctly? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Very good. The defendant is 8 9 present. Good morning, ma'am? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning. 11 THE COURT: She is represented by Alex 12 Reichert. Good morning, Mr. Reichert. 13 14 MR. REICHERT: Good morning, Your Honor. THE COURT: And the United States is 15 represented by Nick Chase. Good morning, Mr. Chase. 16 17 The Department of Probation is present as 18 well via interactive television. We are here for a change of plea and sentence pursuant to a Plea Agreement 19 that had been filed with the District Court on the 23rd 20 2.1 of March, 2020. I have a Superseding Indictment that 22 we're proceeding on that was filed with the District 23 Court as document No. 17 on April 17th of 2019. 24 I show that Ms. Liu has been in custody 25 since March 5 of 2019; is that correct, ma'am?

```
That's correct, Your Honor.
1
                THE DEFENDANT:
2
                THE COURT:
                           What I show is that there will
3
    be a plea to Count Two of the Superseding Indictment.
                Mr. Chase, does that look correct?
 4
5
                MR. CHASE: Yes, it is, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: Thank you, sir. We have several
 6
7
    people in the courtroom today. Mr. Chase, do we
    anticipate an evidentiary hearing?
8
                MR. CHASE: No, Your Honor.
10
                THE COURT: Mr. Reichert, do you have
11
    anybody who will be presenting testimony besides your
    client?
12
13
                MR. REICHERT: I do not, Your Honor.
14
                THE COURT:
                           Thank you. Ms. Liu, what I'd
15
    like to do, having established your presence and the
    presence of your attorney and First Assistant United
16
17
    States Attorney Chase, is I would like to have you be
18
    placed under oath and then we'll have a conversation
19
    between us, okay? So you may remain seated. Please
20
    raise your right hand and the clerk of court will
2.1
    administer an oath.
22
                (Oath administered.)
23
                THE COURT: And, ma'am, just a couple
24
    things. You can pull that microphone as close as you
25
    can and I appreciate that you're masked but it would
```

```
help the court reporter for you to remove your mask if
1
2
    you're comfortable with that, if you and your counsel
    are. Then you'll want to speak as clearly as you can
3
    into the microphone.
4
                I'll start out with how are you feeling this
5
6
    morning?
7
                THE DEFENDANT: I'm feeling okay. Thank you
    for asking, Your Honor.
8
9
                THE COURT: Sure. You're clearheaded this
    morning?
10
11
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.
12
                THE COURT: You have had an opportunity to
13
    confer with your counsel, Mr. Reichert?
                THE DEFENDANT: I have.
14
15
                THE COURT: Okay. Are you wanting to
    proceed with the hearing this morning?
16
17
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
18
                THE COURT: Are you satisfied with the
    representation that you've received in this matter?
19
20
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
2.1
                THE COURT: Ms. Liu, you are under oath so
22
    any statement that you make is subject to scrutiny so
23
    it's important that you are truthful, okay?
24
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.
25
                THE COURT: You're welcome. And you're not
```

```
under the influence of any drugs or alcohol this
1
2
    morning?
3
                THE DEFENDANT: No, I'm not.
                THE COURT: I have the Superseding
 4
    Indictment and what I'd like to do is just review Count
5
6
    Two with you. Count Two states that on the Superseding
7
    Indictment that the grand jury charges that between on
    or about February 15 of 2019 and March 5 of 2019, in the
8
    District of North Dakota, that you did knowingly attempt
10
    to acquire, transfer, directly and indirectly, receive,
11
    retain, own, possess and use and threaten to use a
12
    chemical weapon, in violation of Title 18, United States
    Code, Section 229(a)(1) and (2). As I indicated this is
13
14
    Count Two of the Indictment. The Superseding Indictment
    also consists of a Count One, false statements, and a
15
16
    Count Two of fictitious name or address. If we end up
17
    not moving forward pursuant to the Plea Agreement, I
18
    will review those other two counts with you but at this
    point it would appear to be not necessary.
19
20
                Do you understand the charge in the
2.1
    Superseding Indictment?
22
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, Your Honor.
23
                THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Liu, I have a Plea
24
    Agreement in front of me and a Plea Agreement
25
    Supplement. The Plea Agreement is document No. 38 on
```

Wе

```
the criminal docket and the Plea Agreement Supplement is
1
2
    document No. 39.
                Mr. Chase, with regards to reviewing the
3
    Plea Agreement and the Supplement -- actually this
4
5
    question is better directed to Mr. Reichert.
                With regards to reviewing the Plea Agreement
6
7
    and the Plea Agreement Supplement, Mr. Reichert, do you
    anticipate a time during the hearing where it will be
8
    prudent to go in-camera to review the supplement or
    would that be something that's not necessary, sir?
10
11
                MR. REICHERT: I think in an abundance of
12
    caution, Your Honor, that would make some sense.
                THE COURT: Well, then here's what we're
13
    going to do. I'm going to review the Plea Agreement
14
15
    itself with you and then I'm going to go in-camera and
    we'll empty the courtroom to review the Plea Agreement
16
17
    Supplement. After we're done with the supplement then
18
    we'll let everybody come back into the courtroom, reopen
    the proceeding and then we'll proceed, okay?
19
20
                THE DEFENDANT: Sounds good, Your Honor.
2.1
                THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Liu, with regards to
22
    the Plea Agreement, if you have any questions at any
23
    time, don't hesitate to get the attention of your
24
    attorney or my attention. Your attorney has a
```

tremendous amount of experience in federal court.

25

```
can stop the proceeding at any time and have you consult
1
2
    with your counsel, okay?
3
                THE DEFENDANT: Sounds good. Thank you,
    Your Honor.
4
                THE COURT: You're welcome.
5
                                              The Plea
6
    Agreement indicates that the charges in the Superseding
7
    Indictment are as I've set forth. They indicate that
    you've read the charges and that your attorney,
8
    Mr. Reichert, has fully explained the charges to you.
    The Plea Agreement indicates that you fully understand
10
    the nature and the elements of the charged crime.
11
    Plea Agreement indicates that you'll voluntarily plead
12
13
    guilty to Count Two of the Superseding Indictment.
14
                Is that accurate, Ms. Liu?
15
                THE DEFENDANT: That is accurate, Your
16
    Honor.
17
                THE COURT: Okay. Paragraph 5 sets forth
18
    that this is a nonbinding Plea Agreement.
    understand the difference between a nonbinding and a
19
20
    binding Plea Agreement?
2.1
                THE DEFENDANT: My attorney explained it to
22
    me, yes.
23
                THE COURT: Okay. Basically a nonbinding
24
    Plea Agreement, which is what this is, dictates that if
25
    the Court refuses to accept any or all of the terms that
```

```
we would still proceed and you would not be given the
1
2
    right to withdraw your guilty plea. I'll tell you and
    your attorney and the attorney for the United States
3
    that my intent -- absent something extraordinary, my
4
5
    intent is to accept the Plea Agreement, okay?
                THE DEFENDANT:
                                Thank you.
 6
7
                THE COURT: Paragraph 6 in the Plea
    Agreement is a factual basis and I will reserve the
8
9
    entering of the factual basis until you enter your plea.
    But have you had an opportunity to review paragraph 6
10
11
    and do you understand it?
12
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I had the opportunity
    to review it and I understand it, Your Honor.
13
14
                THE COURT: Okay. The maximum penalty for
15
    Count Two is any term of years. So life imprisonment
    would -- could be the maximum penalty. The maximum fine
16
17
    is $250,000. The maximum term of supervised release is
18
    not more than five years. There is a $100 special
19
    assessment that must be applied to this.
20
                Do you understand?
2.1
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
22
                THE COURT: Okay. Paragraph 8 on page 3 of
23
    9 delineates several subparagraphs that set forth the
24
    rights that you are surrendering by pleading guilty.
25
                With regards to the first paragraph, you are
```

surrendering the right to a speedy public jury trial.

```
2
    That jury would be composed of 12 people selected at
    random. You and Mr. Reichert would choose those jurors.
3
    That jury would be instructed, Ms. Liu, that they would
4
5
    have to return a unanimous verdict. I want you to
6
    understand that I would instruct the jury that you are
7
    presumed innocent and that that jury could not find you
    quilty unless they came back unanimously in favor of
8
9
    quilt.
                Additionally, Mr. Chase and the United
10
11
    States of America would bear the entire burden of proof.
12
    You would have no burden of proof at a trial. They
13
    would have to find you guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.
    And in our system beyond a reasonable doubt is the
14
15
    highest burden of proof in the judicial system.
16
                Do you understand that?
17
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, Your Honor.
18
                THE COURT: And do you wish to waive your
19
    right to a jury trial?
20
                THE DEFENDANT:
                                Yes.
2.1
                THE COURT: With regards to that trial, you
22
    would have the opportunity to present witness testimony.
23
    You would have the opportunity to cross-examine
24
    witnesses that the United States brought. You would
25
    have the opportunity to examine their evidence. If you
```

```
had witnesses that you wanted brought to court but had a
1
    hard time finding them or you couldn't get them here,
2
    the Court would issue a subpoena requiring them to be
3
    here on your behalf.
4
5
                Do you understand that?
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, Your Honor.
 6
7
                THE COURT: And do you wish to waive that
    right?
8
                THE DEFENDANT:
                               Yes.
                THE COURT: Okay. I would instruct the
10
11
    jury, Ms. Liu, that you have a privilege against
12
    self-incrimination. You could decline to testify and
13
    that jury would be instructed that they can draw no
    inference of guilt from your refusal to testify. So you
14
15
    could testify but you would not be required to testify.
16
                Do you wish to waive your privilege against
    self-incrimination?
17
18
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, Your Honor.
19
                THE COURT: You have the right to remain
20
    silent as well but under the terms of this Plea
2.1
    Agreement I'm asking you questions to ensure there's a
22
    factual basis for your plea.
23
                Do you understand that?
24
                THE DEFENDANT: I do understand.
25
                THE COURT: By pleading, Ms. Liu, you would
```

```
1
    be pleading quilty and giving up all of the rights set
2
    forth in paragraph 8. There would be no trial.
3
    Paragraph 9 indicates that Mr. Reichert has explained
4
    those rights to you and the consequences of your waiver;
    is that correct?
5
                THE DEFENDANT: That's correct, Your Honor.
 6
7
                THE COURT: So would you be pleading guilty
    because you are in fact quilty of the crime as charged?
8
9
                THE DEFENDANT:
                                Yes.
10
                THE COURT: Okay. I will be imposing a
11
    sentence in this matter that is sufficient but not
12
    greater than necessary to set forth -- to comply with
13
    the purposes of the Sentencing Reform Act.
14
                Has Mr. Reichert reviewed that with you?
15
                THE DEFENDANT:
                                 Yes.
                THE COURT: You understand that this Plea
16
17
    Agreement is only binding upon Mr. Chase and his office,
18
    that it's not binding upon any other United States
    Attorney's office?
19
20
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
2.1
                THE COURT: And, Ms. Liu, this Plea
22
    Agreement is not binding on any other state level or
23
    local prosecutor as well. Do you understand that?
24
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
25
                THE COURT: The United States Attorney does
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

reserve the right to notify any local or state or federal agency by whom you're licensed or with whom you do business of your conviction. And at the same time you are relying on representations from Canadian officials that this Plea Agreement represents a global resolution to this matter both in the United States and in Canada; is that correct? THE DEFENDANT: That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Chase, may I assume from that that the government in Canada is not pursuing any charges? MR. CHASE: Yes, Your Honor. That is certainly what all of our understanding is, yes. Thank you. In the Presentence THE COURT: Investigation -- or in the Plea Agreement, Ms. Liu, your attorney and Mr. Chase have agreed that the base offense level for sentencing is a 30 base offense level. They also have agreed that you would receive a two-level downward adjustment for acceptance of responsibility and a one-level downward adjustment for timely notification. I'm blending the issues here a little bit but I note that on the Presentence Investigation Report, which is document No. 43 in the Register of Actions, that pages 6 and 7 mirror the computation that is done in the Plea Agreement. So the calculation of the

```
offense level after adjustments is a 30. That's what
1
2
    was estimated in the Plea Agreement, and positively in a
    good fashion that's also what the Presentence
3
4
    Investigation Report indicates.
5
                Do you have any questions about that?
                THE DEFENDANT:
                                No, Your Honor.
 6
7
                THE COURT: The reason that I bring that up
8
    is that if the Presentence Investigation Report were
9
    different than the Plea Agreement sometimes that
    complicates things just a little bit but that isn't the
10
11
    case here so I just wanted you to know that.
12
                Now at sentencing, which would be today,
13
    Ms. Liu, both parties agree to jointly recommend a
14
    sentence of six years of imprisonment. They recommend
15
    that you be ordered to pay restitution in an amount to
    be established today and that there would be a motion by
16
17
    the United States to dismiss Count One and Count Three
18
    of the Superseding Indictment.
19
                Is that your understanding?
20
                THE DEFENDANT: That's correct, Your Honor.
2.1
                THE COURT: Mr. Chase, I note in the
22
    Presentence Investigation Report that there is not a
23
    restitution figure. Is that accurate?
24
                MR. CHASE: That's correct, Your Honor.
25
                THE COURT: Okay. This is something that I
```

```
should have touched on at the beginning of the hearing,
1
    Mr. Chase, but under 18 U.S. Code 3771 the United States
2
    has a duty to notify victims of hearings and their right
3
    to attend.
 4
                Has that been done in this case?
5
                MR. CHASE: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
7
                THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Liu, paragraph
    17 sets forth that if you violate any terms of the Plea
8
9
    Agreement, if you engage in any further criminal
    activity or if you fail to appear for sentencing that
10
    the United States would be released from its
11
12
    commitments.
13
                Do you understand that?
14
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, Your Honor.
15
                THE COURT: Since we're having the change of
    plea and the sentencing on the same day, that's not
16
17
    going to happen so I'm just wanting to review that with
18
    you and make sure that you understand that term.
19
                THE DEFENDANT:
                                 Thank you.
20
                THE COURT: You're welcome. I will gloss
2.1
    past paragraph 18 because that refers to restitution
22
    which Mr. Chase has indicated doesn't apply.
23
                The United States has indicated that it will
24
    file a supplement in this case as is routinely done.
25
    They have filed that supplement. It is dated March 23rd
```

```
1
    of 2020. The supplement is document No. 39 in the
2
    criminal docket. The Plea Agreement is document No. 38.
3
    We'll review the supplement shortly. I'm going to
4
    complete the Plea Agreement first.
5
                With regards to the waiver of appeal in
6
    paragraph 20, Ms. Liu, you have broadly and generally
7
    waived your right to appeal in this Plea Agreement.
    Eighth Circuit typically upholds those waivers. Do you
8
9
    understand that except in a couple of very limited
10
    instances you have waived your right to appeal in this
11
    matter?
12
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
13
                THE COURT: And is that your intent?
14
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
15
                THE COURT: Okay. Paragraph 21 sets forth,
    Ms. Liu, how you have waived your right to withdraw your
16
17
    quilty plea or to attempt to withdraw your quilty plea.
18
    In fact, if you attempted to withdraw your quilty plea
19
    that could be considered a violation of the Plea
20
    Agreement even.
2.1
                Do you understand that?
22
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
23
                THE COURT: Do you still seek to waive that
24
    right?
25
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
```

```
1
                THE COURT: The United States in paragraph
2
    23 agrees that if following sentencing you seek a prison
    transfer to Canadian custody the United States will not
3
4
    oppose that request. Do you understand that?
5
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: Paragraph 24 indicates that you
6
7
    have read and understand all provisions of the Plea
8
    Agreement, that you and Mr. Reichert have discussed the
9
    matter and reviewed the Plea Agreement and that you
10
    understand your rights in this matter; is that correct,
11
    Ms. Liu?
12
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, that's correct, Your
13
    Honor.
14
                THE COURT: Ms. Liu, does the Plea Agreement
15
    in this matter represent your full understanding with
    the United States of America?
16
17
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
18
                THE COURT: Ms. Liu, have any other promises
19
    or assurances been made to you in an attempt to make you
20
    plead guilty?
2.1
                THE DEFENDANT: I believe they are covered
22
    in the Plea Agreement. The two main promises that I
23
    guess motivated me to accept this Plea Agreement is one,
24
    it's a global resolution so that I will not be
25
    prosecuted in Canada for the same offense, and the
```

```
second promise is that neither the United States
1
2
    government nor the Canadian government will object my
    request to transfer to Canada to serve my sentence.
3
                THE COURT: Very good. Has anybody
 4
5
    threatened you to make you plead guilty?
6
                THE DEFENDANT:
                                No.
7
                THE COURT: And you do understand that it is
    a nonbinding Plea Agreement?
8
9
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
                THE COURT: Mr. Reichert, were all formal
10
11
    plea offers in this matter communicated to your client?
12
                MR. REICHERT:
                                They were, Your Honor.
13
                THE COURT: Ms. Liu, with a felony
14
    conviction in our system there are certain rights that
15
    are lost: the right to vote or to hold public office,
    the right to possess a weapon, the right to serve on a
16
17
    jury.
18
                Do you understand that?
19
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
20
                THE COURT: And do you still wish to plead
21
    quilty?
22
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
23
                THE COURT: Any questions about your rights
24
    or the Plea Agreement?
25
                THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
```

```
THE COURT: At this point we're going to go
1
2
    in-camera. I'm going to ask that those of you in the
3
    courtroom please exit. Lori will help to show you out
    and as soon as we're done reviewing the Plea Agreement
 4
5
    Supplement we'll get back on the record and you'll be
    welcome to come back in. And the courtroom security
6
7
    officer will let you know when that happens, okay?
    We'll go in-camera.
8
9
                (Observers removed from the courtroom and
10
    the following in-camera proceedings were had:)
11
                THE COURT: Before we begin, Ms. Helderop,
12
    are you able to hear me?
13
                MS. HELDEROP: I am, Your Honor.
14
                THE COURT: Thank you. Okay. I just wanted
15
    to make sure. I didn't check at the beginning of the
16
    hearing.
17
                Okay. Mr. Reichert, do you want to explain
18
    what's going on with the supplement, sir?
19
                MR. REICHERT: Thank you, Your Honor.
20
    have a supplement in this case which contemplates a 5K1
2.1
    given my client's substantial assistance to the
    government. It is the reason for the reduction from the
22
23
    calculated guideline range in this case down to the six
24
    years that we currently have.
25
                If you would like the details of the
```

2.1

cooperation, we'd can provide that to you, the government can provide it, however the Court would like it.

THE COURT: I'm perfectly fine without the details. I think part of it is delineated in paragraph 5. I've also reviewed the file and the Presentence Investigation Report so I can kind of read between the lines on that as well.

Mr. Chase, is there anything that you'd like to add about the supplement?

MR. CHASE: No, Your Honor. Just, you know, only a little bit about the nature of her cooperation just to create a good enough record on the 5K. You know, some of the information is still being verified but to the extent that it can be verified law enforcement determined it's a hundred percent truthful to the extent she knows. It is information that's not related so much to this case but it is -- suffice to say that especially given Ms. Liu is not somebody who is the typical person who is -- finds themselves in jail very often and has provided information that is of a type that I would think most people would be -- have a high level of concern about providing this kind of information about these kinds of persons who have perpetrated them.

2.1

I just wanted to make that point. I will make a 5K as part of my recommendations and the 5K is already -- has been filed on the record. But I won't go too much into it in my sentencing recommendation, Your Honor, but it is the type of information that if I found myself in jail and provided it would concern me very much about my safety in jail and I'm sure Ms. Liu has been concerned as well.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Chase.

Mr. Reichert, do you have anything further to add before we go back on the record?

MR. REICHERT: Yeah, I guess I will, Your
Honor, since this is the only chance that I will do this
and I know the Court is going to follow the Plea
Agreement most likely so I'm not going to expound. But
my client upon incarceration in Grand Forks County found
herself a cellmate of a person from the Spirit Lake
Indian Reservation who was a very bad person to say the
least and found solace in confessing many crimes to my
client, including four unsolved murders on the
reservation, gun running, drug running. So it was very
significant and as the Court can probably see I have
about an inch of yellow pages here. The vast majority
of that is Steve Melby and the FBI officer and myself

2.1

sitting down on a weekly basis as Ms. Liu would come in with notes written on toilet paper that she had hidden to accurately write down everything that she was being told.

So, yes, I think it was very significant cooperation and I think that puts in context here why we have come up with the sentence that we have.

THE COURT: You know, the guideline range is 97 to 121 months. Agreed-upon sentence is 72 months.

I've already indicated that my inclination would be to accept the Plea Agreement.

Is it the United States' position that imposition of a sentence of less than 72 months would be rejecting a term of the Plea Agreement or would it be accepting the Plea Agreement since the only promise is that you'd make that recommendation?

MR. CHASE: Your Honor, that's an unknown.

I'm sorry, that's an unknown. I don't know how the

Canadians are going to interpret that. I do think -
and this will be as part of my sentencing recommendation

and I'm not -- I don't want to jump the gun here. There

was a lot of groundwork here done on -- I mean, on

anything. I mean, any definition of what a substantial

step is in an attempted murder, I mean, there are -- I

can't imagine -- you know, I mean, there were a lot of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

```
substantial steps. There's more planning and steps
taken in this -- the not completed murder attempt than
there are in completed crimes. I mean, you know, my
recommendation is -- is going to be that 72 months is
sufficient as Your Honor will see and I don't mean to
invite all of that now.
            So that is going to be my recommendation,
you know, and six years was -- I mean, it is -- there's
a lot of factors that Mr. Reichert and I were weighing,
you know, with the Canadians with, you know, trying to
in some ways protect the defendant from a second
prosecution. It's also extraordinary that we agreed to
the -- to not oppose the transfer to Canadian custody or
for prison transfer. We've never agreed to that.
            The reason we agreed to that more in this
case again -- you can cut me off because I'm way far
afield but it is -- it's partly to do with the
cooperation that was done in this case but it's also a
recognition of -- most of this crime is Canadian crime.
The victims are Canadian. You know, the -- there was --
there was a reach into the dark web.
            THE COURT: I saw that on the Presentence
Investigation.
            MR. CHASE: That was the United States.
mean, this -- the obtaining of the toxin was going to
```

happen in the United States. She crossed the border. 1 2 But, I mean, this crime is a crime in the United States, you know, only -- a significant part in getting a highly 3 4 deadly toxin. And obtaining that in the United States 5 and then going back is certainly a significant crime that happened in this country. But most of this crime, 6 7 the planning, the -- any carrying out is a Canad- -- so 8 that's also a significant sort of what we see as a --9 that we've given in this Plea Agreement. THE COURT: And I'll interrupt you and if we 10 11 get into any more of that we'll just do it out of 12 in-camera but I do appreciate your elaboration, 13 Mr. Chase. Thank you, very much. Mr. Reichert, do you have anything further 14 15 to add? 16 MR. REICHERT: Yeah, Your Honor, I do. And 17 I think it makes sense that -- we're basically arguing 18 about the sentence here now and I think that makes sense because it is so intertwined with the cooperation. 19 20 I echo what Mr. Chase said. We would ask the Court also 2.1 to impose the six-year sentence because that is a global 22 resolution. The Canadian officials -- part of their reason for not prosecuting is an agreement that she will 23 24 get six years down here and so that is an integral part 25 of it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

So if the Court even -- if the Court thought it was giving a benefit by doing that, it would probably be a detriment because then she might be prosecuted in Canada. And, I mean, as you can imagine this is a fantastic resolution in a lot of ways for my client. She's never going to have a Canadian criminal record. And she's an engineer and she is going to be looking for a job so that will be very important to her and then also the fact that she's going to, you know, serve somewhere in the neighborhood of another year in Canada once we get her transferred to Canada no matter what this Court gives her for a sentence. THE COURT: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Reichert. Mr. Reichert, Mr. Chase, I have one more thing that is appropriately handled in-camera. the United States marshal hand me a note and it is written by a Greta Bundy. "Honorable Judge Welte, if you feel it is appropriate, may we please say a prayer for Sijie before she leaves the courtroom today? Greta Bundy." My response to that would be absolutely. Ms. Liu will not be permitted any physical contact, however, but a brief pause for a prayer would be permissible.

Is that an okay response with the United

```
States and Mr. Reichert?
1
2
                MR. CHASE: Yeah. I don't have an objection
    to that, Your Honor.
3
 4
                MR. REICHERT: I have no objection. I just
    asked my client if she would have an objection, Your
5
6
    Honor, and she indicated that she would not.
7
                THE COURT: Okay. I will hand this to the
    clerk of court and if the deputy U.S.M. could come on
8
9
         Thank you, sir.
    up.
                I think it's time to go back on the record.
10
11
                (In-camera proceedings concluded and
12
    observers allowed back into the courtroom.)
13
                MR. REICHERT: Your Honor, while the people
    are filing in, I just would also like to put on the
14
15
    record for the Court's information, my client did retain
    Canadian counsel in this case and he has been involved
16
17
    in a vast majority of the negotiations in this case just
18
    so the Court is aware of that.
19
                THE COURT: Thank you. I'll note that for
20
    the record that Ms. Liu has retained Canadian counsel
2.1
    and that Canadian counsel has been involved in the
22
    negotiations in this matter as reflected by
    Mr. Reichert.
23
24
                Ms. Liu, do you have any questions at all
25
    about your rights?
```

```
THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't, Your Honor.
1
2
                THE COURT: Do you have any questions about
3
    the Plea Agreement?
                THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
 4
                THE COURT: And other than what we've
5
    discussed, the Plea Agreement does represent your full
6
7
    understanding with the government?
8
                THE DEFENDANT: (Nods head.)
9
                THE COURT: Yes?
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
10
11
                THE COURT: Okay. Then how do you now plead
12
    to charge two in the Indictment? Do you plead guilty or
    not quilty?
13
14
                THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
                THE COURT: Mr. Chase, a factual basis?
15
                MR. CHASE: Your Honor, in January of 2019 a
16
17
    person then unknown to the United States started
18
    searching on the dark web for a toxin, a highly deadly
19
    toxin to be purchased. Negotiations occurred throughout
20
    January -- I should just add, on that date around the
2.1
    January 2019 when -- right after those communications on
22
    the dark web had started occurring to purchase this
23
    toxin, the defendant opened up a commercial mailbox in
24
    Pembina, North Dakota under the name Julie Chen, which
25
    was a false name and the -- she set this up remotely
```

2.1

with an e-mail address. The Julie Chen mailbox was set up with a password that matched a mailbox that the defendant already had in her own name of Sijie Liu.

There's just a -- for the record there is sort of a number of people who have -- Canadians have mailboxes on just this side of the border because shipping costs are expensive and so it is a legal common function. There's a number of commercial mailboxes in Pembina, North Dakota that are owned by Canadians.

But in January of 2019 the defendant opened one up in a different name, Julie Chen. The negotiations for that toxin, how it was going to be delivered, what the cost was, occurred throughout January-February. Finally there was an agreement for the defendant to purchase that toxin and have it sent -- she asked to have it sent to Pembina, North Dakota to the commercial mailbox that she had created in the name Julie Chen.

On March 5th of 2019, the defendant did -after she had gotten receipt that the toxin -- what she
believed was a toxin being delivered, which actually the
people she was communicating with were undercover
employees with the FBI. There was never a toxin that
went through the mail. There was never a toxin at the
post office unbeknownst to the defendant.

2.1

So when the defendant got a notice that her package had arrived in Pembina, she came to the border, the U.S./Canadian border. She identified herself under her legitimate name with her car that is registered to her as Sijie Liu, came through the port of entry, and at the port of entry she stated to the people at the port of entry that she was just going to go into North Dakota to go shopping. She didn't reveal that she was going in to pick up any packages in Pembina, but she drove directly to the Pembina mailbox, commercial mailbox company.

She went in, identified herself as Julie
Chen and got the package, which she believed was a
toxin. She also had several other packages that were
delivered both to her, and she also asked for any
packages in the name of Sijie Liu and she stated that
Sijie Liu was a friend of hers and she was there to pick
up her packages as well. The sum total of these
packages included the package that she believed to be a
toxin as well as a number of high-grade respirators and
other equipment for handling dangerous toxins.

The defendant was encountered in -- after she had left the commercial mailbox company. The materials she put in her vehicle. The moment she was encountered by law enforcement she almost immediately

2.1

stated: I knew -- I know what I did was wrong. And they also stated to her that they were about to search her vehicle and asked her if there was anything that they should know about before they search her vehicle and she stated: Yes, there's a toxin. There is something that is painful; thereby admitting that she knew what was in the box and also warning law enforcement that if they encountered it that it could be dangerous or deadly.

The investigation that occurred in Canada revealed information that the defendant did have an intended target for this poison, that she had written substantially in journals about her planning ahead of how that she was going to deliver the poison and had even to some degree stalked and done surveillance on her intended target or targets.

And, Your Honor, I think that the defendant again from the get-go has -- again the toxin -- Your Honor, I just want to establish that the toxin under United States Code does qualify because of its makeup or the intended toxin that was going to be delivered as a weapon of mass destruction. And again the place which she picked these up we -- were in Pembina, North Dakota, in this district, and the undercover persons with whom she was communicating with to obtain these toxins were

```
in the United States.
1
                THE COURT: Mr. Chase, Count Two of the
2
3
    Superseding Indictment indicates that this was a crime
    that was committed between February 15th of 2019 and
4
    March 5th of 2019.
5
                I don't want to lose the forest for the
6
7
    trees here. That also is the time frame that is
8
    contemplated in paragraph 6 of the Plea Agreement.
    However, near the end of that paragraph it indicates
    that on or about February 12th of 2019 she placed an
10
11
    order for the toxin, an apron, a mask and gloves with a
12
    shipping address in Pembina.
13
                Is there any need to tighten up those dates?
                MR. CHASE: I don't see a reason to, Your
14
15
    Honor. If I'm -- I might be missing something I guess.
16
                THE COURT: Looks like the step to place the
17
    order was made three days prior to the date of the
18
    Information -- or of the --
19
                MR. CHASE: In the Indictment?
20
                THE COURT: In the Indictment.
2.1
                MR. CHASE: Right. Because in the
22
    Indictment it reads on or about what?
23
                THE COURT: February 15.
24
                MR. CHASE: Okay. Your Honor, I think that
25
    the "on or about" language covers the --
```

1 THE COURT: Yeah. If there are jury 2 instructions that's what it would say, too, so --3 MR. CHASE: I missed it immediately, Your Honor. It might have been a typo. As I'm thinking 4 5 about it now, I don't know the reason for that. THE COURT: Mr. Reichert, I don't mean to 6 7 get too supercilious but would your client waive any 8 objection to that if there were an issue with the date? 9 MR. REICHERT: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. Any comment on the 11 factual basis, Mr. Reichert? 12 MR. REICHERT: No, Your Honor. In speaking 13 with my client just now and listening to it, we believe that it's accurate. 14 15 THE COURT: Thank you. It's the finding of this Court that Ms. Liu is fully competent and capable 16 17 of entering an informed plea. It's the finding of the 18 Court that Ms. Liu is aware of the nature of the charges and the consequences of her plea. It's the finding of 19 20 the Court that Ms. Liu's plea is a knowing and a 2.1 voluntary plea that is supported by an independent basis 22 in fact containing each of the essential elements of the 23 crime as charged. I accept your plea and you're now 24 adjudged as guilty of that offense. 25 We'll now move on to the sentencing portion

2

3

4

7

8

10

24

25

```
of this hearing. Counsel, I have the Presentence
    Investigation Report that was prepared by Kera Helderop
    of the United States Probation Office. She is present
    by interactive television. The Presentence
5
    Investigation Report is document No. 43 and was filed
    one week ago today. I note that there are no objections
6
    from the United States that are set forth on the
    addendum to the Presentence Investigation Report.
                Does that remain the case, Mr. Chase?
                MR. CHASE: Yes, Your Honor.
11
                THE COURT: Thank you. And I note that
12
    there are none by the defendant as well, none submitted,
13
    but I would certainly entertain any objections if you
14
    had any, Mr. Reichert.
15
                MR. REICHERT: Your Honor, I would not couch
    what I have as objections. I would count them as
16
17
    corrections. Given the quick turnaround of this, when I
18
    met with my client we didn't have time to give those to
    the PSI writer. I have communicated them to the United
19
20
    States and to her. I would lay them out briefly for the
2.1
    Court and you'll see that they're not terribly
22
    important, but just putting them on the record I think
23
    is sufficient. I don't think we need to correct the PSI
    itself.
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. REICHERT: The first one, Your Honor, would be on the second page. It says that she is a Canadian National. She is not. She is a Canadian citizen. That is clarified however in paragraph 41. So while I think that might have been something important enough to put in there, it is corrected at item 41 so I don't see a need to formally correct that document. Number -- at paragraph 6 it says that she bought the protective equipment with cryptocurrency. She actually bought it from Amazon with -- through the regular credit card process but I think that makes absolutely no difference. At paragraph 8 she was apprehended within inches of leaving the door of the facility, not in her vehicle. Again I don't think that that is necessary to correct. And then again at 9, searching the packages in her vehicle, they weren't searched in her vehicle. They were searched right outside of the facility. So very minor, Your Honor, but I think it's -- who knows how this will follow her. If it becomes important, we could go back to this record and point that out. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Reichert. Your client is a Canadian citizen but she is a Chinese

```
1
    National.
                MR. REICHERT: She is not. She is a
2
3
    Canadian citizen only.
 4
                THE COURT: Thank you.
                                But she was born in China.
5
                MR. REICHERT:
                THE COURT: Okay.
 6
7
                MR. REICHERT: And was naturalized in
    Canada.
8
9
                THE COURT: All right. So on the
    immigration status she is not a Chinese National.
10
11
    will take note of that.
12
                Mr. Chase, any comment to the clarifications
    by Mr. Reichert?
13
14
                MR. CHASE: No, Your Honor.
15
                THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Liu, I think I
    know the answers to these questions but I want to ask
16
    them to make sure.
17
18
                Have you had an opportunity, a sufficient
    opportunity to review the Presentence Investigation
19
20
    Report with Mr. Reichert?
2.1
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, Your Honor.
22
                THE COURT:
                           I note, Ms. Liu, that you are
23
    highly educated and so in light of that do you
24
    understand the Presentence Investigation Report?
25
                THE DEFENDANT: I believe I do, Your Honor.
```

2.1

THE COURT: Okay. The Presentence

Investigation Report, Ms. Liu, is really gathered just to give the Court information. I am bound to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984. In order to do that, I need information and this is a very complete Presentence Investigation Report.

Your counsel has been given an opportunity to posit objections to that. He has posited some useful clarifications. The United States has had no objections or corrections. As I indicated earlier, I'm accepting the Plea Agreement as set forth. And I realize that both parties have put a tremendous amount of work into this file, and I certainly want to effectuate both the purposes of the Sentencing Reform Act and additionally I wanted to reflect the work of the parties in getting a resolution to this matter.

Ms. Liu, there's more to this file than the Presentence Investigation Report, okay? There are several letters that I have received on your behalf. They are filed with the District Court and I suspect that Mr. Reichert has reviewed them with you. They're all filed under document No. 45 with the District Court but they're also noted as 45-1, 45-2, 45-3 and 45-4.

2.1

Chaplain Mike Sonju at Jail Chaplains; 45-1 is a letter from Walton Li, from your husband, and it is a letter of support of two pages. Document 45-2 is a letter of support from Adam Smith, your ex-husband, and it is a well-written letter of support. 45-3 is a letter of support from Chunwei Liu and Xianying Yang, your parents, and it too is a very well-written letter of support. Document 45-4 is a letter of support that gives great insight into your character. It is written by Eileen Chung and I'm certain, as I said, that you have had an opportunity to review these.

Mr. Chase, your sentence recommendation.

And you sure may remain seated and just speak into the microphone.

MR. CHASE: Okay. Your Honor, the United States -- as reflected in the Plea Agreement, we are recommending a period of six years, 72 months. You know, the -- this defendant is somebody who, you know, is one of those defendants who never does anything wrong and does everything right, is a high achiever until something goes very, very badly for them in their life. And there are just many people who under the very wrong circumstances get to a very dark place in their life.

And that appears to be what has happened to

the defendant. She got into a very dark place in her life. And, you know, I think it's human nature for people to -- when they get into dark places in their lives, and it happens to people, everybody, that you have some idea, like some kind of revenge fantasy or some kind of revenge thought. Wouldn't it be great if that person got run over by a bus or something? I mean, everybody's had those thoughts.

Looking at this case skeptically though is that this went beyond a revenge sort of fantasy, even writing about it in the journal. This is somebody as the Court noted is highly educated, highly trained scientifically, went through scientific calculations in terms of how this particular toxin would affect a person just upon touch. And it is a highly -- this particular toxin ended up killing one of the leading experts who studied this toxin just in -- obviously not through carelessness but what that person felt was careful treatment of it. So this particular toxin's a highly deadly toxin. There were -- going onto the dark web, again beyond the normal revenge fantasy that somebody would have, you know, the -- all of the information in the record about surveilling the intended subjects.

Now, you know, on the other hand none of us knows whether or not in the end the defendant would have

2.1

followed through with this. She did -- the thing that always impresses me the most, and I say it every time it happens, is that the moment that she is approached by law enforcement she gave it all up. I think that's charitable, and maybe even a fair reading of that is that this is not somebody who has a stomach for following through with something. At least that's what -- I hope that that was the case.

And on the other hand we may have saved one or two people's lives with law enforcement, what they did in this case. And none of us really will ever know and maybe the defendant doesn't even know how far she was prepared to go. But she warned law enforcement that there was going to be a toxin that they would run across because she believed there was. I also believe that speaks well of her. I think that is something that is -- you know, to me it tells me that maybe she wouldn't have followed through, maybe. The fact that she gave up everything showed me she didn't have a determination or a hard stomach to commit a crime.

I think after that period, Your Honor, she has met with law enforcement. I know that the law enforcement who are meeting with her started out very skeptical of what her intentions were and I think, you know, have come around in time thinking that she has met

2.1

with them in good faith and is somebody that they found believing.

So she had all the makings of a crime here, Your Honor, and she committed it to be sure. You know, the question is: Was the defendant willing to go through with killing somebody and -- which is really far afield from going online and making up a fake name and fantasizing about revenge and going through all the super spy stuff of getting the materials on the dark web. Actually doing it was another thing and I -- none of us again will ever know whether or not the defendant was willing to do that.

The Plea Agreement is reflective of the seriousness of this crime including, you know, all of the steps for what could have been an attempted murder in Canada on the Canadian side. You know, at the same time the defendant provided cooperation to law enforcement. She also provided what she believed was lifesaving warning to law enforcement, again which at the same time was an admission of her guilt without any promise in return. Just out of her own concern for their safety.

Your Honor, I think the six-year recommendation that the parties are -- is a fair, just, no-more-than-necessary sentence that reflects the

```
seriousness of this crime, reflects both the seriousness
1
2
    of the crime that this defendant committed and the --
    sort of the other qualities that she has shown in her
3
    life both before and after this crime.
4
5
                Your Honor, so again our recommendation is
    for the six years as reflected in the Plea Agreement.
6
7
    Thank you.
8
                THE COURT: Mr. Chase, the Plea Agreement
9
    reflects the six years. I note that the Department of
    Probation has indicated that no supervised release is
10
11
    part of that. Are you familiar with that?
12
                MR. CHASE: Yes, Your Honor. I'm -- I am --
13
    I shouldn't say -- we don't recommend any period of
    supervised release.
14
15
                THE COURT: Yeah. According to U.S.
    Sentencing Guideline 5D1.1(c), the Court ordinarily
16
17
    should not impose a term of supervised release in a case
18
    in which supervised release is not required by statute
19
    and the defendant is a deportable alien who likely will
20
    be deported after imprisonment.
2.1
                Are you recommending a fine?
22
                MR. CHASE: No, Your Honor, and mostly
23
    because we'd have no way of collecting that fine.
24
                THE COURT: Oh, okay. Mr. Reichert, before
    you present your recommendation, I should nail it down
25
```

```
from both you and the United States. I had done a
1
2
    computation of a total offense level of 30. Ms. Liu has
    a Criminal History Category I with zero points.
3
                Mr. Reichert, any objection to my
 4
    calculation there?
5
 6
                MR. REICHERT:
                               No, Your Honor.
7
                THE COURT: Thank you. And, Mr. Chase, no
    objection?
8
9
                MR. CHASE: No, Your Honor.
10
                THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Reichert, your
11
    recommendation, please.
12
                MR. REICHERT: Thank you, Your Honor.
                                                        Wе
13
    also would ask the Court to impose the agreed-upon
    six-year sentence with no term of supervised release.
14
15
    The amount of negotiation that has gone into this
    spanned many, many months, lawyers in two jurisdictions,
16
17
    prosecutions in two jurisdictions and I think it really
18
    on balance is a really good Plea Agreement for all sides
    that covers all of the (a) factors and all of the (e)
19
20
    factors, Your Honor. And so we would ask that the Court
2.1
    do that.
22
                Now we are going to ask for one other thing,
23
    Your Honor, and that is something that the Court is
24
    powerless to do but the Court -- I know that the BOP
    does consider this. So we are not able to initiate the
25
```

2.1

process of her transfer back to Canada until this -until today, until this sentencing is complete. And it
may take a period of time. As soon as we get out of
here, I'm going to be contacting the BOP and the
marshals service in order to see if we can keep her from
being transferred to Oklahoma to the Federal Transfer
Center because it doesn't make any sense to take
somebody from here where they've got the COVID lockdown,
they know what's going on, transfer her to another
facility, and then at some point transfer her back to
Canada.

So I know the Court is allowed to make recommendations about where somebody is to be placed and that the BOP doesn't have to follow that. What we would just ask is that the Court recommend to the BOP that she be left in Grand Forks -- or, I mean, in Fargo for as long as possible before being transferred because we are trying to effectuate this transfer to Canada and I think for all parties involved, including the BOP, that makes sense. So we would ask for that recommendation and we would also ask the Court to follow the Plea Agreement, Your Honor.

There is only one other issue that my client has asked that I bring up and I think is important, and that is what Mr. Chase said about her alerting law

```
enforcement I think is telling but also the fact that a
1
2
    ruse was required in order to get her to come down to
    get the toxin. She knew that the toxin had arrived.
3
    She was wondering whether she should go down or not, and
4
5
    they told her that the package had been damaged by a
    water leak and in her mind people could be injured by
6
7
    that and that is -- I'm not going to say the only reason
    but that is certainly one of the reasons and the reason
8
9
    that she came down so quickly after that.
                But on balance, Your Honor, I think that
10
11
    this is a well-reasoned Plea Agreement and we would ask
12
    the Court to follow it. Thank you.
13
                THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Reichert, if I
    were to make the recommendation that she be -- that she
14
15
    remain in Cass County as long as possible in order to
    facilitate her transfer to Canada, would that be
16
    satisfactory?
17
18
                MR. REICHERT: That would be, Your Honor,
19
    and I would appreciate that. Thank you.
20
                THE COURT: You're welcome.
2.1
                Anything further from the United States?
22
                MR. CHASE: No, Your Honor.
23
                THE COURT: Before I turn to your client for
24
    an allocution, Mr. Reichert, anything further from the
25
    defense?
```

```
1
                MR. REICHERT: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
2
                THE COURT: Ms. Liu -- actually one more
3
    thing.
 4
                Ms. Helderop, you've heard the statements of
5
    counsel for both sides. Do you have anything to add in
6
    this matter?
7
                MS. HELDEROP: Nothing further. Thank you.
8
                THE COURT: Thank you.
9
                All right, Ms. Liu, I wanted to clear off
10
    the table there so that -- so you understand that it's
11
    now yours. This is an opportunity for you to make an
12
    allocution. I will note that in the Presentence
13
    Investigation Report that you had foregone the
    opportunity upon the advice of counsel to discuss the
14
15
    instant offense and you indicated that a statement would
    be provided and your statement is noted on document
16
17
    No. 43, the Presentence Investigation Report, on pages 5
18
    and 6 of 15.
19
                So I have that statement from you and I have
20
    considered that. If you have anything further that
2.1
    you'd like to add, I would certainly be wanting to hear
22
    that. But I also don't want you to feel like you have
23
    to say anymore, okay? So it's up to you.
24
                THE DEFENDANT: I just want to apologize,
25
    Your Honor. I'm so, so sorry about everything. I don't
```

```
know what I was thinking and I've been regretting it
1
2
    every single day. I feel so much pain and shame in my
    heart I can't even begin to explain or express how sorry
3
    I am. I just ask you to please give me a chance to
4
5
    prove to you that this is not me. This is not who I am.
    Please give me a chance to make positive changes in my
6
7
    life and make amends to my family.
8
                THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Liu.
9
                There's a motion before the Court pursuant
    to 5K1.1 and 18 U.S. Code 3553(e). That motion is the
10
11
    government's motion and joined by the defendant. I
12
    grant that motion. I also will grant the motion of the
    United States to dismiss Counts One and Three as soon as
13
    that motion is made.
14
15
                MR. CHASE: So moved, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: And no objection from you,
16
    Mr. Reichert?
17
18
                MR. REICHERT:
                               No, Your Honor.
19
                THE COURT: Thank you. So Counts One and
20
    Three are dismissed.
2.1
                Ms. Liu, this is one of the most interesting
    cases that I've had. And you are highly educated. You
22
23
    are bright. You're articulate. You're only 37 years
24
    old. You've had quite a life up to this point, and the
25
    Court is pleased that after justice is administered in
```

2.1

this case that it appears that you'll have a chance to resume that life in Canada thanks to your efforts and the efforts of counsel.

You have a Master's degree. You have a tremendous mind. I can tell you the -- there's an old adage that there is strength in numbers. I can tell you that sometimes that adage isn't true. You have five letters of support here. That might not be a tremendous number but the substance of these letters is striking. You have some people who care about you an awful lot and these are the people that know you and so that ought to be heartening.

Additionally, Ms. Liu, what you did was a very serious crime and it could have resulted in people being seriously hurt. That is something that the Court views with an appropriate amount of scrutiny. I think that the Plea Agreement does reflect a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Sentencing Reform Act.

Before I impose sentence though I want you to understand that although this is very serious that it doesn't have to define you. You're still very young and you have a lot of life ahead of you. You've got somewhere around 15 months in custody already so my hope is that when you are done with this that you get back

2.1

onto the trajectory of life that you had prior to this matter.

I must impose a sentence, Ms. Liu, sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes provided in 18 U.S. Code 3553(a). I've considered all of the sentencing factors in this matter. I've considered the statements of Mr. Chase, the statements of Mr. Reichert, your statement. I hereby adopt the Presentence Investigation Report and all the facts and information herein. Pursuant to the Rules of Criminal Procedure, I do so without objection from either the government or the defense.

I've considered the entire file in this matter and pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 it's the judgment of this Court, Ms. Liu, that you shall be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for 72 months. Following that term of imprisonment, you shall not be on supervised release. I will take note of United States Sentencing Guideline Section 5D1.1(c) in not imposing that term of supervised release. I will not impose a fine in this matter. I will impose the \$100 special assessment.

Ms. Liu, I'm going to make recommendations and the recommendation that I'm going to make is that you be placed in Cass County and remain in Cass County

```
as long as possible in order to facilitate your physical
1
2
    transfer to Canada pursuant to the Plea Agreement and
3
    the Plea Agreement Supplement that were filed as
    document Nos. 38 and 39 respectively in this case.
4
5
                Even though you have waived your right to
    appeal, Ms. Liu, you do have a couple of very narrow
6
7
    windows to appeal pursuant to the Plea Agreement, and if
    you decide to attempt to exercise that you have 14 days.
8
9
    So that would be 14 days from today, okay? Mr. Reichert
    as I indicated is very experienced. He can certainly
10
11
    advise you well on that.
12
                Anything else from the United States,
    Mr. Chase?
13
14
                MR. CHASE: No, Your Honor.
15
                THE COURT: From the defense?
16
                MR. REICHERT: No, Your Honor.
17
                THE COURT:
                             Ms. Liu, good luck to you.
18
                THE DEFENDANT:
                                 Thank you, Your Honor.
19
                THE COURT: Thank you. We are adjourned.
20
                (Adjourned at 12:15 p.m.)
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, Kelly A. Kroke, a duly appointed Registered Professional Reporter; DO HEREBY CERTIFY that I reported in shorthand the foregoing proceedings had and made a record at the time and place indicated. I DO HEREBY FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing and attached (49) typewritten pages contain an accurate transcript of my shorthand notes then and there taken. Dated this 18th day of February, 2022. /s/ Kelly A. Kroke KELLY A. KROKE - RPR, RMR United States District Court Reporter District of North Dakota Eastern Division